



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/072,266

02/05/2002

Kenji Fukasawa

MIPFP003

2068

25920

7590

04/10/2006

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 200
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

CASCHERA, ANTONIO A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2628

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,266	FUKASAWA, KENJI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Antonio A. Caschera	2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 and 43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-2-06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in the pending application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 9, 11-16, 22, 24-30, 33-35, 38 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishii et al. (U.S. Patent 5,982,416).

In reference to claims 1, 13, 14 and 25-27, Ishii et al. discloses an image processing apparatus and method performing color matching processing of image data along with device profile data transfers (see column 1, lines 6-9). Ishii et al. discloses the apparatus comprising of an image pickup unit and scanner which both acquire image data into the system (see column 3, lines 51-61). Ishii et al. discloses a CMS process unit which comprises of input and output device color matching processes coupled to both input and output device profile storage units (see column 4, lines 34-39 and #14 and 15 of Figure 1 and #14, 15, 23, 24, 26 and 25 of Figure 3). Ishii et al. further goes on to disclose the output profile data possibly being conversion data

Art Unit: 2628

including color space compression instructions according to color reproducible by the output device (see column 4, lines 50-53). Note, the Office interprets the CMS process unit acting functionally equivalent to the output control data acquisition mechanism of Applicant's claims since the output device CMS unit (#24 of Figure 3) acquires output device color reproducible data defining the conditions set forth by the output device to faithfully display image data. Ishii et al. also discloses implementing multiple output devices, therefore requiring multiple output device profiles, each profile associated with a specific output device (see column 4, lines 20-30, columns 4-5, lines 65-4 and #21 and 22 of Figure 1). Ishii et al. discloses a data multiplexing unit in a transmission-side configuration of the device, for embedding color space characteristic data, in a file with image data and transmitting this file as output (see column 7, lines 20-45 and Figures 8 and 16). Note, Ishii et al. also discloses alternatively, embedding characteristic data based on the type of output device, with image data (see column 7, lines 32-34).

In reference to claims 2 and 15, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 1 and 14 respectively above in addition, Ishii et al. further discloses reading out specific output device profile data according the specific type of output device (see column 4, lines 54-64) therefore, the Office interprets the profile data of Ishii et al. to inherently comprise of some sort of identifier data to associate the profile with a specific output device.

In reference to claims 3 and 16, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 1 and 14 respectively above. Ishii et al. discloses implementing multiple output devices, therefore requiring multiple output device profiles, each profile associated with a specific output device (see column 4, lines 20-30, columns 4-5, lines 65-4 and #21 and 22 of Figure 1). The Office interprets the output device corresponding CMS process unit acting

Art Unit: 2628

functionally equivalent to the designating mechanism of Applicant's claims since it must choose the correct profile for each output device designated to received image data (see column 4, lines 20-30).

In reference to claims 9 and 22, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 1 and 14 respectively above. Ishii et al. discloses a CMS process unit which comprises of input and output device color matching processes coupled to both input and output device profile storage units (see column 4, lines 34-39 and #14 and 15 of Figure 1 and #14, 15, 23, 24, 26 and 25 of Figure 3).

In reference to claims 11 and 24, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 1 and 14 respectively above. Ishii et al. discloses the apparatus comprising of an image pickup unit and scanner which both acquire image data into the system (see column 3, lines 51-61). Ishii et al. also discloses a data reception unit receiving data from the image pickup unit and scanner device (see column 4, lines 11-16).

In reference to claims 12 and 28, claims 12 and 28 are equivalent in scope to claims 1, 13, 14 and 25-27 and are therefore rejected in a similar manner. In addition, Ishii et al. also discloses the apparatus comprising a computer that includes RAM and ROM memories for storing a program to perform the above CMS methods (see column 4, lines 5-10).

In reference to claims 29, 33 and 34, Ishii et al. discloses an image processing apparatus and method performing color matching processing of image data along with device profile data transfers (see column 1, lines 6-9). Ishii et al. discloses the apparatus comprising of an image pickup unit and scanner which both acquire image data into the system (see column 3, lines 51-61). Ishii et al. discloses a CMS process unit which comprises of input and output device color

Art Unit: 2628

matching processes coupled to both input and output device profile storage units (see column 4, lines 34-39 and #14 and 15 of Figure 1 and #14, 15, 23, 24, 26 and 25 of Figure 3). Ishii et al. further goes on to disclose the output profile data possibly being conversion data including color space compression instructions according to color reproducible by the output device (see column 4, lines 50-53). Note, the Office interprets the CMS process unit acting functionally equivalent to the output control data acquisition mechanism of Applicant's claims since the output device CMS unit (#24 of Figure 3) acquires output device color reproducible data defining the conditions set forth by the output device to faithfully display image data. Ishii et al. also discloses implementing multiple output devices, therefore requiring multiple output device profiles, each profile associated with a specific output device (see column 4, lines 20-30, columns 4-5, lines 65-4 and #21 and 22 of Figure 1). Ishii et al. discloses a data multiplexing unit in a transmission-side configuration of the device, for embedding color space characteristic data, in a file with image data and transmitting this file as output (see column 7, lines 20-45 and Figures 8 and 16). Note, Ishii et al. also discloses alternatively, embedding characteristic data based on the type of output device, with image data (see column 7, lines 32-34).

In reference to claims 30 and 35, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 29 and 34 respectively above. Ishii et al. discloses a CMS process unit which comprises of input and output device color matching processes coupled to both input and output device profile storage units (see column 4, lines 34-39 and #14 and 15 of Figure 1 and #14, 15, 23, 24, 26 and 25 of Figure 3). Note, the Office believes the apparatus of Ishii et al. inherently acquires new or different profile data when the output device, the target device receiving the processed image data, is changed.

In reference to claim 38, claim 38 is equivalent in scope to claims 29, 33 and 34 and is therefore rejected in a similar manner. In addition, Ishii et al. also discloses the apparatus comprising a computer that includes RAM and ROM memories for storing a program to perform the above CMS methods (see column 4, lines 5-10).

In reference to claim 43, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above. Ishii et al. further goes on to disclose the output profile data possibly being conversion data including color space compression instructions according to color reproducible by the output device (see column 4, lines 50-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4-8, 10, 17-21, 23, 31, 32, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii et al. (U.S. Patent 5,982,416) in view of Kohler et al. (U.S. Patent 5,646,752).

In reference to claims 4, 17, 31, 32, 36 and 37, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 2, 15, 29, 30 and 34 respectively above however, Ishii et al. does not explicitly disclose identifying at least one classification selected from a group of classifications consisting of output device category, output device format, manufacturer, and output device model name. Kohler et al. discloses a system for modifying device profile tags

Art Unit: 2628

(see column 1, lines 64-67 of Kohler et al.). Kohler et al. discloses the profiles comprising of a “DeviceModel” tag stored within the profile (see column 9, lines 11-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the device profile formatting of Kohler et al. with the CMS profile processing techniques of Ishii et al. in order to allow for customizable data to be stored and represented in device profiles, aiding in color transformation processing of image data (see column 2, lines 7-41 of Kohler et al.).

Note, in reference to claims 31 and 36, the Office interprets that the tag information of Kohler et al. inherently identifies and is designated to each device. Note, in reference to claim 32 and 37, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the device profile formatting of Kohler with the CMS profile processing techniques of Ishii et al., enabling the output device CMS processing unit of Ishii et al. to select the correct device profile based on a device name or model, to aid in the CMS processing of image data by allowing for customizable data to be stored (device model/name information) and accessed in the device profiles (see column 2, lines 7-41 of Kohler et al.).

In reference to claims 5, 6, 18 and 19, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 3 and 16 above however, Ishii et al. does not explicitly disclose the output device CMS process unit acquiring profile data with reference to a classification level. Kohler et al. discloses a system for modifying device profile tags (see column 1, lines 64-67 of Kohler et al.). Kohler et al. discloses the profiles comprising of a “DeviceModel” tag stored within the profile (see column 9, lines 11-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the device profile formatting of Kohler with the CMS profile processing techniques of Ishii et al., enabling the output device CMS processing

unit of Ishii et al. to select the correct device profile based on a device name or model, to aid in the CMS processing of image data by allowing for customizable data to be stored (device model/name information) and accessed in the device profiles (see column 2, lines 7-41 of Kohler et al.).

In reference to claims 7 and 20, Ishii et al. and Kohler et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 4 and 17 respectively above. Ishii et al. also discloses implementing multiple output devices, therefore requiring multiple output device profiles, each profile associated with a specific output device (see column 4, lines 20-30, columns 4-5, lines 65-4 and #21 and 22 of Figure 1). Kohler et al. discloses the profiles comprising of a “DeviceModel” tag stored within the profile (see column 9, lines 11-19).

In reference to claims 8 and 21, Ishii et al. and Kohler et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 7 and 20 respectively above. Neither Ishii et al. nor Kohler et al. explicitly disclose the output formats including xerographic printing, sublimation printing, ink jet printing, CRT display, LCD display, projection display, transmissive display, and reflective display formats. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the above specific output formats in the CMS profile format and processing techniques of Ishii et al. and Kohler et al.. Applicant has not disclosed that supporting these specific output formats provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant’s invention to perform equally well with the monitor and printer profiles of Ishii et al. because the office interprets the exact output format that image data is transformed into to be a matter of design choice as preferred by the designer and to which best suits the applicant at hand.

Further, the specific manner in which the image data is ultimately displayed or printed is seen to provide no immediate criticality to the application at hand. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify the combination of Ishii et al. and Kohler et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 21.

In reference to claims 10 and 23, Ishii et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 1 and 14 respectively above. Although Ishii et al. discloses a CMS process unit which comprises of input and output device color matching processes coupled to both input and output device profile storage units (see column 4, lines 34-39 and #14 and 15 of Figure 1 and #14, 15, 23, 24, 26 and 25 of Figure 3), Ishii et al. does not explicitly disclose generating profile data. Kohler et al. discloses a system for modifying device profile tags (see column 1, lines 64-67 of Kohler et al.). Kohler et al. discloses the system comprising inputting and storing steps for inputting color image data and storing device profile tags (see column 11, lines 35-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the device profile formatting of Kohler et al. with the CMS profile processing techniques of Ishii et al. in order to allow for customizable data to be stored and represented in device profiles, aiding in color transformation processing of image data (see column 2, lines 7-41 of Kohler et al.).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 01/23/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In reference to claims 1-38 and 43, Applicant argues that Ishii et al., "...does not disclose a configuration that transfers image data and output control data from the image processing apparatus to the output device," (see page 12, 1st paragraph of Applicant's Remarks). Even further, Applicant argues that the Examiner's interpretation of Ishii et al. is incorrect in that the image processing apparatus of Ishii et al., "...cannot reasonably be considered to correspond to the output device in the claimed subject matter because the data transferred from the image pickup unit...does not include the profiles of the output device," (see page 12, 2nd paragraph of Applicant's Remarks). The Office disagrees and firstly points out that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "a configuration that transfers image data and output control data from the image processing apparatus to the output device") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claims only state, specifically in the preamble of claim 1, "...generating image data to be outputted by an output device," (see lines 1-2 of claim 1). Nonetheless, the Office interprets Ishii et al. to disclose outputting to an output device when Ishii et al. discloses outputting profile characteristic data multiplexed with image data (see column 5, lines 21-24 and Figure 4). Also, Ishii et al. explicitly discloses embedding characteristic data (profile data) based on the type of output device with image data (see column 7, lines 32-34). Therefore, the Office maintains its current rejection based upon Ishii et al. including the rejection incorporating Kohler et al. as Applicant's arguments directed to Kohler et al. are similar to the above in view of Ishii et al..

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Antonio Caschera whose telephone number is (571) 272-7781. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays between 7:00 AM and 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung, can be reached at (571) 272-7794.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2628


571-273-8300 (Central Fax)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

aac

aac
4/5/06

PATENT EXAMINER


Kee M. Tung
Primary Examiner